



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.			FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO. 5983		
10/649,817			Hiroto Kasuga	S-2491/DIV			
7590 06/17/2004				EXAM	EXAMINER		
Leonard W. Sherman Sherman & Shalloway				PUTTLITZ, KARL J			
413 N. Washing	gton Street		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
Alexandria, VA 22314				1621			
				DATE MAILED: 06/17/2004			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
Office Action Summary			Application	No.	Applicant(s)				
			10/649,817		KASUGA ET AL.				
			Examiner		Art Unit				
			Karl J. Puttlit		1621				
Period for	- The MAILING DATE of this commu Reply	nication appe	ears on the co	ver sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ldress			
THE N - Extens after S - If the p - If NO p - Failure Any re	PRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD IN AILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNISIONS of time may be available under the provision MIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comparison of time may be available under the provision with the provision of the maximum so the to reply is specified above, the maximum so to reply within the set or extended period for reply ply received by the Office later than three months of patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.136 munication. (30) days, a reply statutory period will y will, by statute, or	6(a). In no event, within the statutory Il apply and will ex cause the applicat	however, may a reply be tim y minimum of thirty (30) days pire SIX (6) MONTHS from to ton to become ABANDONET	ely filed will be considered timely the mailing date of this of	y. ommunication.			
Status									
1)🛛 1	Responsive to communication(s) fil	ed on 28 Aug	gust 2003.						
	☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.								
Dispositio	on of Claims								
5)□ (6)⊠ (7)□ (4) Claim(s) 5 and 11-13 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 5 and 11-13 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 								
Applicatio	n Papers								
9) <u></u> ⊤	he specification is objected to by th	ne Examiner.							
10)∐ T	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any obje			•	• •				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including he oath or declaration is objected t	="	·			` '			
Priority ur	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12)	cknowledgment is made of a claim All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority Copies of the certified copies application from the Internations the attached detailed Office actions.	documents documents of the priorit	have been re have been re y documents (PCT Rule 17	eceived. eceived in Application have been received 7.2(a)).	n Nod in this National S	Stage			
Attachment(s	•								
	of References Cited (PTO-892)		4)	Interview Summary (I					
3) 🔲 Informa	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (Fation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or No(s)/Mail Date	-10-948) · PTO/SB/08)	5) 6)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date Notice of Informal Pa Other:		-152)			

Art Unit: 1621

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 5 objected to because of the following informalities: "a" should be inserted before "method' in claim 5, line 3. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 5 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 5 and 11-13 recite that th4e catalyst has "reduced" activity. This term is indefinite since one of ordinary skill is without a point of reference to determine how catalyst activity is "reduced".

Prior Art Rejections

The claims of the application are drawn to, inter alia, a process for producing methacrylic acid through catalytic vapor-phase oxidation of methacrolein or catalytic vapor-phase oxidative dehydrogenation of isobutyric acid, characterized by using a catalyst which has been reactivated by the method comprising treating a catalyst for use in methacrylic acid production by vapor-phase oxidation of methacrolein or vapor-phase oxidative dehydrogenation of isobutyric acid, which catalyst containing P and Mo and exhibiting reduced

Art Unit: 1621

activity, with a gas containing a nitrogen-containing heterocyclic compound, and steam.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 5 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0058582 to Kasuga et al. (Kasuga).

Kasuga teaches a method of reactivating a catalyst for methacrylic acid production is provided, said catalyst being used in the occasions of producing methacrylic acid through vapor-phase oxidation of methacrolein or vapor-phase oxidative dehydrogenation of isobutyric acid, containing P and Mo and exhibiting reduced catalytic activity, which method is characterized by treating the catalyst with a gas which contains a nitrogen-containing heterocyclic compound. See paragraph 0008.

The method is further characterized by treating the catalyst with a gas which contains a nitrogen-containing heterocyclic compound and steam; or with a

Art Unit: 1621

gas which contains a nitrogen-containing heterocyclic compound and another gas which contains steam. See paragraph 0009.

The nitrogen-containing heterocyclic compound to be is at least one compound selected from pyridine, piperidine, piperazine, quinoline and derivatives thereof is conveniently used. See paragraph 00014.

The foregoing anticipates the rejected claims within the meaning of section 102.

Applicant cannot rely upon the foreign priority papers to overcome this rejection because a translation of said papers has not been made of record in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55. See MPEP § 201.15.

Claims 5 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent No. 4,814,305 to Kamogawa et al. (Kamogawa).

Kamogawa teaches that a highly active catalyst can be regenerated by treating the deactivated catalyst with aqueous ammonia and an aqueous solution containing at least one of a nitrogen-containing heterocyclic compound, an amine, and ammonium carbonate, in the presence, if necessary, of nitrate ions and/or either aqueous hydrogen peroxide or ozone.

The patent teaches regeneration of a phosphorus-, molybdenum- and alkali metal-containing catalyst for the production of an unsaturated carboxylic acid by vapor-phase oxidation of an unsaturated aldehyde.

Art Unit: 1621

Nitrogen-containing heterocyclic compounds or amines which can be used include, for example, pyridine, piperazine, pyrimidine, pyrazine, piperazine, triethylamine, triethanolamine, and hydrochlorides, sulfates and nitrates of them.

See column 2, lines 61-65.

Steam is added as an ingredient for the reaction. See examples.

The foregoing anticipates the rejected claims within the meaning of section 102.

Claims 5 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 60232247 (JP 247).

This patent teaches regeneration of a molybdophosphoric acid catalyst with a nitrogen containing heterocyclic ring containing compound. The catalyst is used for the vapor phase oxidation of organic compounds.

The foregoing anticipates the rejected claims within the meaning of section 102.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which

Art Unit: 1621

said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kasuga, Kamogawa, and JP 247 (the applied references), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,716,895 to Sugi et al. (Sugi).

The applied references do not explicitly teach application of steam. It is for this proposition that the examiner applies Sugi. Specifically, Sugi illustrates that application of steam to regenerate molybdophosphoric acid catalyst is commonplace in the art. See column 1, lines 27-43. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to modify the applied references to add steam since Sugi teaches that this application increases surface area of the catalyst. See column 1, lines 39-43. Therefore, the combined references render the rejected claims obvious since the combination teach the elements of the claimed invention with a reasonable expectation of success.

Double Patenting

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Art Unit: 1621

Claims 5 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims, 1-26 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,664,206

This is a double patenting rejection.

Claims 5 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-8 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,673,733 This is a double patenting rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karl J. Puttlitz whose telephone number is (571) 272-0645. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (alternate).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on (571) 272-0646.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Karl J. Puttlitz

Assistant Examiner

Johann R. Richter, Ph.D., Esq. Supervisory Patent Examiner

Biotechnology and Organic Chemistry

Art Unit 1621 (571) 272-0646